1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Case No. 2:03-cr-0247-JAM-DAD P 12 Respondent, ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION 13 v. 14 MATEO ESTRADA 15 Movant. 16 17 Presently before the Court is Movant Mateo Estrada's 18 ("Movant") Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. #135) of Magistrate 19 Judge Drozd's Order (Doc. #134) denying Movant's motion to set 20 aside a previous § 2255 judgment (Doc. #129). 21 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and E.D. Cal. Local Rule 303 govern the 22 standard for a Motion for Reconsideration. The district court "may 23 reconsider any pretrial matter . . . where it has been shown that 24

1

the magistrate judge's order is clearly erroneous or contrary to

"[R]eview under the clearly erroneous standard is significantly

law." 28 U.S.C. § 363(b)(1)(A); E.D. Cal. Local Rule 303(f).

deferential, requiring a definite and firm conviction that a

25

26

27

28

mistake has been committed." Sec. Farms v. Int'l Bhd. of Teamsters, 124 F.3d 999, 1014 (9th Cir. 1997) (internal quotations omitted). Under the contrary to law standard, "a District Court may overturn a Magistrate Judge's conclusions of law which contradict or ignore applicable precepts of law, as found in the Constitution, statutes or case precedent." Enns Pontiac v. Flores, No. 1:07-cv-01043-LJO-BAM, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 24263, at *13 (E.D. Cal. Feb. 27, 2012) (internal quotations omitted).

Upon review of the entire file, the Court finds that Judge Drozd appropriately applied the factors from Ashford v. Steuart, 657 F.2d 1053, 1055 (9th Cir. 1981), and denied Movant's motion. It is therefore apparent that Judge Drozd's Order is neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law.

Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, upon reconsideration, the Order of the Magistrate Judge filed June 29, 2012, is affirmed. Movant's Motion for Reconsideration is denied.

Dated: August 6, 2012

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Mende